

REMARKS

Applicants submit the following remarks in response to the Decision on Appeal, mailed on September 14, 2010. Currently, claims 2-8, 18-26, 33-40, and 43-48 are pending in this case with claims 43-48 being independent. Claims 9-13, 27-32, and 41 have been previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. In this paper, Applicants also cancelled claims 1, 14-17, and 42 to accommodate Examiner's objections and to expedite prosecution of this application to allowance. Claims 1, 14-17, and 42 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 43-48 are new. Claims 2-3, 6-8, 18-19, 22-25, 33, 35, and 37-39 have been amended to correct dependencies and various informalities.

The subject matter of the new independent claims 43-48 is based on the originally filed claims 1-42 and, as such, Applicants believe that examination of these claims can proceed based on the references uncovered by the Examiner and no additional searching should be required. No new matter has been added.

Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the opportunity to discuss the above application during a telephonic interview on November 10, 2010. The following is a summary of the conducted interview.

- (1) no exhibits were discussed or shown at the interview;
- (2) claim 1 was discussed;
- (3) U.S. Patent No. 6,081,262 to Gill et al. was discussed;

(4) The Examiner and Applicants discussed potentially patentable aspects of the subject matter described in the present application as well as reviewed the file to determine whether amendments to the claims could be made to further distinguish the claims from Gill and place the application in condition for allowance.

The Examiner and the Applicants did not reach an agreement with regard to the discussed claims and the cited Gill reference.

Cited References

In the September 14, 2010 Decision on Appeal, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter, the "Board") affirmed the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3, 6-8, 14-19, 22-26, 33, 35, and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

6,081,262 to Gill et al. (hereinafter, "Gill"). The Board also affirmed the Examiner's rejection of claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill. Further, the Examiner's rejection of claims 4-5, 20-21, 34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,655 to Fields et al. (hereinafter, "Fields") was also affirmed. Applicants respectfully submit that the new independent claims 43-48 along with their respective dependent claims are patentable over Gill, Fields, and/or their combination.

New claim 43 recites, *inter alia*, a method of building a presentation. The method includes using a multimedia content application, accessing a page containing multimedia content from a multimedia source, wherein the multimedia content includes at least one tag; automatically identifying multimedia content on the page by parsing the page using the at least one tag; displaying an identifier for the page containing the multimedia content, a window for previewing at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page, and a window for entry of user-definable notes associated with at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page; selecting by a user at least some of the multimedia content identified on the page while the page is being accessed or used by the multimedia content application; and using a presentation application, copying from the multimedia source, at least some of the multimedia content selected by the user based on the at least one tag, any user-definable notes entered by the user and associated with the at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page, and the identifier for the page containing the multimedia content into at least one presentation folder located in a memory. The presentation application is configured to use information stored in the at least one presentation folder to build the presentation.

Gill

Gill appears to disclose a multimedia presentation generation system for combining media objects of multiple diverse types into an integrated multi-media presentation. Gill regulates spatial relationships between objects in the presentation. (Gill, Col. 3, lines 21-24). Gill's multi-media presentation generation system includes a menu driven multi-media presentation generation system. (Gill, Col. 5, lines 10-12). Gill's system further includes page based document layout system Q that has a page layout capability allowing a user to define a workspace of predetermined physical extent, where the workspace is divided by the user into a plurality of objects. (Gill, Col. 5, lines 27-32). Gill allows the user to define the content and function of each of these workspaces individually as well as their integration with the other

objects in the workspace to form the entirety of presentation. (Gill, Col. 5, lines 37-40). Gill includes an authoring tool that assigns a unique identification to each object that has multi-media information and is located in the multi-media presentation to distinguish it from static objects in the presentation. Gill partitions an underlying page using a menu based system into a plurality of boxes that can be edited by the user. (Gill, Col. 6, lines 23-27). Gill's system enables its user to take existing documents prepared for a print medium and convert them to multi-media presentations. (Col. 4, lines 35-37). Gill's users define the content and function of each of the workspaces individually and integrate them in the workspace to form the presentation. (Col. 5, lines 37-40). Also, Gill discloses that information for inclusion in a presentation can be "downloaded from external sources...such as Internet S4" (Col. 5, line 65 to Col. 6, line 8). The exported files are non-editable and can be viewed in a viewer, which translates multimedia presentation data into the images for display on the user's display device. Gill identifies data objects in its presentation by tags that note the multimedia nature of data objects.

However, Gill fails to disclose, teach or suggest all elements recited in claim 43. In particular, Gill fails to disclose "automatically identifying multimedia content on the page by parsing the page using the at least one tag," as recited in claim 43. Instead, Gill's objects appear to be already identified distinguishing them from Gill's static objects, where the objects are obtained from available sources. This is different from the automatic identification of multimedia content through parsing the page using at least one tag.

Gill also fails to disclose, teach or suggest "displaying an identifier for the page containing the multimedia content, a window for previewing at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page, and a window for entry of user-definable notes associated with at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page," as recited in claim 43. Instead, Gill's viewer appears to only allow viewing of completed static presentations, rather than allowing a user to view the multimedia content as it is identified and to make notes that can be associated with the content that will be selected by the user. Gill does not appear to allow its user to preview the pages having an identified multimedia content.

Also, Gill states that its presentation content is pulled from various sources but it does not appear to disclose how its users select content for presentation. This is different from the presently claimed embodiments that allow users to select at least some of the multimedia content that is identified on the page while the page is being accessed or used by the multimedia content

application, contrary to the recitation of claim 43. Gill appears to have a plurality of available resources from which content is pulled for presentation but does not disclose that users are able to select content while such content is being accessed or used.

Gill also fails to disclose, *inter alia*, “selecting by a user at least some of the multimedia content identified on the page while the page is being accessed or used by the multimedia content application” and “using a presentation application, copying from the multimedia source, at least some of the multimedia content selected by the user based on the at least one tag, any user-definable notes entered by the user and associated with the at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page, and the identifier for the page containing the multimedia content into at least one presentation folder located in a memory,” as recited in claim 43. Instead, as stated above, Gill uses an available plurality of resources from which content is pulled, but does not appear to allow its users to select multimedia content and copy it along with user notes and other information into memory for building of a presentation.

Hence, Gill fails to disclose, teach or suggest all elements of claim 43. As such, claim 43 is patentable over Gill. Independent claims 44-48 are patentable over Gill for at least the reasons stated above with regard to claim 43. Dependent claims 2-8, 18-26, and 33-40 are patentable over Gill for at least the reasons stated above with regard to the independent claims 43-48, respectively. With regard to claims 8 and 24, Applicants note that Gill fails to create a content record that includes an identifier associated with said multimedia content having said tag, a memory index field corresponding to the multimedia content selected by the user, and a notes field corresponding to the user-definable notes associated with at least some of the identified multimedia content. Instead, Gill identifies its objects by various tags, however, does not create a content record that contains the above referenced information.

Fields

Claims 2-8, 18-26, 33-40, and 43-48 are patentable over Fields alone and/or over its combination with Gill. Fields relates to managing and formatting electronically-published material distributed over a computer network. Fields replicates published web content and associated advertisements in the context of a hosting web site. Fields brokers a client browser's request for a web page, analyzes the returned content and splits it into component elements, extracts the desired component elements, recasts the desired elements in the look and feel of the hosting site and sends the recast content to the requesting client as a web page. The client

browser interprets the HTML in the web page, presenting the content in the context of the hosting web site. However, Fields appears to suffer from similar deficiencies that are present in Gill. Fields fails to disclose, teach or suggest, *inter alia*, using a multimedia content application, accessing a page containing multimedia content from a multimedia source, wherein the multimedia content includes at least one tag; automatically identifying multimedia content on the page by parsing the page using the at least one tag; displaying an identifier for the page containing the multimedia content, a window for previewing at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page, and a window for entry of user-definable notes associated with at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page; selecting by a user at least some of the multimedia content identified on the page while the page is being accessed or used by the multimedia content application; and using a presentation application, copying from the multimedia source, at least some of the multimedia content selected by the user based on the at least one tag, any user-definable notes entered by the user and associated with the at least some of the identified multimedia content on the page, and the identifier for the page containing the multimedia content into at least one presentation folder located in a memory; wherein the presentation application is configured to use information stored in the at least one presentation folder to build the presentation, as recited in claim 43.

Hence, Fields fails to disclose, teach or suggest all elements of claims 2-8, 18-26, 33-40, and 43-48. As such, claims 2-8, 18-26, 33-40, and 43-48 are patentable over Fields alone and/or over its combination with Gill.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw any rejections that may have been issued during the prosecution of the present application.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the rejections have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. On the basis of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

No additional fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. **14-1315**, reference No. **27996-232-UTIL**. If there are any questions regarding this reply, **the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.**

Dated: November 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,



Boris A. Matvenko, Reg. No. 48,165
Attorney for the Applicants
MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS
GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C.
Chrysler Center
666 Third Avenue, 24th Floor
New York, NY 10017
Tel: (212) 935-3000
Fax: (212) 983-3115